



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,889	11/08/2001	William Peckham	CISCO-5020	5275

7590 02/08/2005

David B. Ritchie
Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

REID, CHERYL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/008,889	Applicant(s) PECKHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner Cheryl M. Reid	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-11, 16-19, 24-27 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg.

Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25

- Goldberg implicitly teaches of a first memory storing a list of one or more ports;.... a list of one or more active sessions...; a verifier communicating with said first memory, verifier periodically checking a session in said list of one or more sessions, said verifier searching for said user in said list of one or more ports....(Col 2, lines 15-65, Col 3, lines 1-15). Goldberg does not explicitly teach of if said session is inactive, verifier updating said session if said user is identified on an other port. Goldberg teaches of tracking connection state (active/inactive) of a session (Col 3, lines 10-15);

Goldberg also teaches of modifying session database (Col 2, lines 43-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Goldberg's invention so that it would modify session database (update) based on tracking connection state information.

Adding the above-mentioned modification would result in a more efficient system because it would allow Goldberg's invention to have up to date or current information about session connections. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modifications.

Claims 8, 16, 24, and 32

- Goldberg teaches of searching a database for a specific session (implicitly implies searching for a user). Goldberg teaches that each session correspondence to a specific socket (port), thus implying network device having one or more ports. (Col 3, lines 20-25, 51-66).

Claims 2, 10, 18, and 26

- Goldberg teaches of deactivating (deleting)session(Col 3, lines 40-50).

Claims 3, 11, 19, and 27

- Goldberg teaches of deactivating(closing) sessions whose timestamps are expired (Col 19, lines 5-20).

3. Claims 4-5,12-13,20-21,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Raab.

Claims 4-5,12-13,20-21,28 and 29

- Goldberg is silent in regards to identifies said user on any port with a Media Access Control address. Raab teaches on this aspect (Col 2, lines 55-63). Goldberg's invention relates to data communication systems (Col 1, lines 5-10). Raab's invention relates to networking systems (Col 1, lines 5-20). Adding the above-mentioned feature to Goldberg's invention would result in a more versatile system because it would extend its functionality to include systems that use MAC. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modifications.

4. Claims 6,14,22,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Beadle.

Claims 6,14,22,30

- Goldberg teaches about searching and updating....(Col 3, lines 15-30).

Goldberg is silent in regards to port hopping setting. Beadle teaches of allowing a client browser to switch from one connection route to another route (i.e. using a different connection route implies that a connection is switching from one port to another, hence port hopping). Beadle teaches of port being enable (Col 2, lines 60-65), the fact that the session is completed on the new route, implies that the port was enabled. Beadle is silent in regards to disabling a port (i.e. connection to port or route cannot be made). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Beadle's invention to allow port to be disable because this would result in a more versatile or secure system. For example, one of ordinary skill in the art might want to restrict certain ports (routes) for specific data transmission (high priority, warnings, etc), thus if certain data did not meet that specific criteria, port (i.e. route) would be disabled. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to make the above-mentioned modification to Goldberg's invention because it would result in a more efficient session tracking system.

5. Claims 7,15,23,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg and Raab, and further in view of Beadle.

Claims 7,15,23,31

- Goldberg is silent in regards to policy setting and retaining policy setting of user at said port. Raab teaches about policy settings (Col 2, lines 55-65, Col 3, lines 1-10). Raab is silent in regards to retaining policy settings of user at said port. Beadle implicitly teaches on this aspect (Col 2, lines 39-67, Col 3, lines 1-12). The fact that connection to new route is made without losing session information, implicitly teaches that the policy settings of the first connection (port, route) are employed in the second connection. Adding the above-mentioned feature to Goldberg's invention would result in a more efficient system because it would allow Goldberg to provide a more efficient session tracking system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on (571)272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacob H. Amy

cmr